

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/220,691

Applicant(s)

TSUJI ET AL.

Examiner

Jon P Weber, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1651

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jon P Weber, Ph.D.

(3) _____

(2) Derek Mason.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 23 June 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,3,4,6 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Explained nature of scope rejection. Enablement requires some correspondance between structure and function. How many of phosphoramidates of 6 made meet claim of not MMP inhibitors? Declaration OK. Question of predictability. Have been successful with Board in similar situation .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required